

Appl. No. 10/790,722
Amendment dated: February 28, 2008
Reply to OA of: November 30, 2007

REMARKS

Applicants have amended the claims to more particularly define the invention taking into consideration the outstanding Official Action. Applicants note that Applicants election of species (a) in claim 16, the species (b) in claim 4 and the additive of claim 11, without traverse, is acknowledged. Applicants have amended the claims and have canceled claims 8-10, 12-14 and 18 from the present application. Applicants submit that the claims now present in the application are fully supported by the specification as originally filed and no new matter is introduced.

The rejection of claims 1-8, 11 and 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention has been carefully considered but is most respectfully traversed in view of the amendments to the claims and the following comments.

The 0.01-6 wt% of release modifier (b) can be obtained by the following calculation: $0.5 \text{ wt\%} \times 0.02 = 0.01 \text{ wt\%}$; $30 \text{ wt\%} \times 0.2 = 6 \text{ wt\%}$. Since according to the original description of (b), the amount of a release modifier is 0.5~30 wt% when based on the weight of (a). Regarding the addition of the component (c) of 74~97.99 wt% solvents, such amendment can be obtained from other calculation.

With respect to claim 1, the Examiner argued that the while the basis for the wt% of (b) is defined, the basis for (a) is unknown. However, one skilled in the art can know that the wt% of (a) is based on the total weight of the release agent. Furthermore, the applicant had amended the 0.5-30 wt% of (b)(based on the weight of (a)) to 0.01-6 wt% of (b)(based on the total weight of the release agent), which are calculated by 0.5×0.02 and 30×0.02 , respectively to emphasize each of the components in the release agent is based on the **total weight of the release agent**. Besides, the examiner also argued that the total of (a) + (b) is significantly less than 100%. According to the examples of the present invention, one skilled in the art can gain the information that the release

Appl. No. 10/790,722
Amendment dated: February 28, 2008
Reply to OA of: November 30, 2007

agent of the present invention comprises (a), (b), and most solvents and the total weight percentage of the release agent must be 100 wt%. Therefore, Applicants have added 74-97.99 wt% of solvents (i.e. component (c)) to claim 1, wherein said the values of 74 and 97.99 are calculated by $100 \text{ minus } (20 \text{ (upper limitation of component a)} + 6 \text{ (upper limitation of component b)})$ and $100 \text{ minus } (2 \text{ (lower limitation of component a)} + 0.01 \text{ (lower limitation of component b)})$, respectively. Accordingly, the amended claim 1 can be supported by the original specification.

In addition, since the Examiner thought that the term of “non-substrate liquid crystal display” is not adequately defined in the specification and does not appear to be conventional in the art, the applicant also replaced the term by “liquid crystal display **without substrates**”. From the “Description of the related art” and Example 14 of the specification, one skilled in the art can easily to understand that the present invention is to provide a method to produce a LCD without rigid substrates such as glass. Therefore, the LCD produced from the present invention is more flexible and thinner than the conventional LCD.

With respect to claim 4, in order to overcome the confusing formula, Applicants have amended the amounts of each unit (i.e. m, n, o, and p) in the original claim 4 to the values in the original claim 8 which didn't reject by the examiner and then canceled the original claim 8. Therefore, the total amount of weight for the silicone is 100% in the amended claim 4.

Applicants most respectfully submit that all of the claims now present in the application are in full compliance with 35 USC 112 and clearly patentable over the references of record.


Applicants note the claim for priority and receipt of the priority document has not be acknowledged. An acknowledgment in the next Official Action will be appreciated.

In view of the above comments and further amendments to the claims, favorable reconsideration and allowance of all the claims now present in the application are most

Appl. No. 10/790,722
Amendment dated: February 28, 2008
Reply to OA of: November 30, 2007

respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
BACON & THOMAS, PLLC

By: 
Richard E. Fichter
Registration No. 26,382

625 Slaters Lane, Fourth Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
Phone: (703) 683-0500
Facsimile: (703) 683-1080
REF/cjw
A01.wpd
February 28, 2008